

## THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN.

Published daily (Sundays excepted) by the  
NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PRINTING COMPANY,  
At 1300 and 1310 Pennsylvania avenue.

TERMS:  
One copy one year, \$5.00 in advance.  
Five copies one year, \$25.00 in advance.  
Single copies, 10 cents.

Entered as second-class matter, May 24, 1882.  
Postpaid by the publisher.  
No money returned for unclaimed copies.

Now is the time to subscribe.  
The price of THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN is paid  
in advance for three months, five copies  
one year, ten copies one year, twenty  
copies one year, fifty copies one year, one  
dollar and a half; six months, three dollars  
and a half; three months, one dollar and  
a half; one month, fifty cents. Postpaid by the  
publisher.

It is delivered in Washington and the suburbs by  
carriers at the same rates.

There is no better time than the present to subscribe for  
the National Republican, and best newspaper published at  
the National Capital. Send copies to your friends.

All communications must be addressed to "The Editor  
of THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN," and to newspaper publishers  
must be sent to the publisher, on one side of the paper only, with  
name and residence of the writer attached. No com-  
munications will be returned.

The issue of THE WEEKLY NATIONAL REPUBLICAN  
commenced on Thursday, January 5, 1882. It is a hand-  
some double sheet of eight pages, containing columns  
of news from all parts of the world, and is  
especially interesting in containing the proceedings of  
the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial branches of  
the Government, including the appointments of  
judges, officers, and members of the cabinet, and  
the proceedings of the Senate and House of  
Representatives.

In short, it is the best and only weekly paper in  
American giving, in addition to all general news,  
a complete record of the proceedings of the  
Government, and the proceedings of the Senate  
and House of Representatives.

Terms: Single copies, 10 cents. Five copies, one  
year, \$5.00 in advance. Ten copies, one year, \$10.00  
in advance. Fifty copies, one year, \$50.00 in advance.  
Single copies, 10 cents. Five copies, one year, \$5.00  
in advance. Ten copies, one year, \$10.00 in advance.  
Fifty copies, one year, \$50.00 in advance.

Now is the time to subscribe.

WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 24, 1882.

Population of the National Capital...150,000.

Amusements To-Night.

CONGRESSIONAL CHURCH—Dr. C. Bangs' benefit.

NATIONAL THEATRE—Equine Paradox.

DRIVER'S GARDEN—Entertainment.

THEATRE COMIQUE—Variety.

ARCADE GARDEN—Concert.

Mr. Conkling on a Recent Libel.

The Kingston (N. Y.) Freeman thought

it worth while a few days since to attempt

a defense of General Sharpe, speaker of

the last New York Assembly, for the

change of his vote, which did much to

terminate the last senatorial struggle in

that State against Mr. Conkling. The

writer in the Freeman stated in substance,

that when Speaker Sharpe's "inclination

to break from Conkling became known"

(an auspicious moment) he was furnished

with an excuse in the form of an allegation

that an understanding was being

reached by which Mr. Conkling should be

re-elected, and that, in place of Mr.

Platt, "the candidate of Vanderbilt and

Gould" was to be also elected, and

that "at least one of those magnates had

interested himself in the adjustment, and

would use his influence for its consum-  
mation."

As Mr. Chauncey M. Depew enjoyed

the distinction of being the candidate

of those two distinguished anti-third-term

Reformers, and of being at the same

time the candidate of their political

guide, philosopher, and friend, James G.

Blaine, and of the Garfield administration,

of whose political interests Mr.

Blaine was the sole guardian, the use

of the phrase "corrupt bargain" by

the Kingston Freeman must have been

an inadvertence. That journal is

careful to refrain from making any

pretended statement, or if any specific

fact which, if true, would be injurious

to Mr. Conkling or any of his friends.

Its story in each fact was to choose

a Senator to settle the prolonged

struggle. It does not even pretend that

Mr. Conkling knew of the compromise

which it says was on foot. To call such

settlement as that would have been a

"corrupt bargain," and then to throw it

out to the public a year later in words

which studiously avoid any specific charge

of wrong-doing against anybody, yet

which artfully carry injurious inferences,

is in strict keeping with the mean, false,

and crafty warfare which some base peo-  
ple have waged upon Mr. Conkling ever

since he returned from his canvass in

behalf of General Garfield in 1880.

Neither he nor his friends did any in-  
direct or unmanly thing in his behalf

in the senatorial struggle referred to. He

entered the contest reluctantly, and did

not flee from it. None were more earnest

in urging him to stand for re-election

than General Sharpe. The Freeman is

especially cruel in mentioning this gen-  
tleman's name in connection with the

thrifty friends who, according to its

story, so greatly desired "relief from a

cruelly false position."

Mr. Conkling being himself inter-  
rogated as to the alleged "bargain," thus

replied in an interview which appeared

in the New York Herald of Monday:

"My habit has been never to reply to slanders,  
however foul. I have for years silently en-  
dured newspaper assaults in this character, and

having not the slightest foundation in fact, I

may be that this habit of silence has encouraged

calumny. Friends tell me that, and, as you ask

it, I will say again that it is due to that infor-  
mation."

"It seems to consist of three parts or three

charges—

"First—That I became a candidate for re-  
election of my own hand, and not by the advice

and wish of my associates."

## Why the Democrats Filibuster.

It is impossible to determine in ad-  
vance what course of action the Demo-  
cratic party will pursue in any given case.

For the past three days it has been filib-  
ustering to retain a solid Democratic

delegation so far as returned from the

South. Its leaders have served notice on

the Republican party that not another

Republican member shall be seated, and

that the House shall not even discuss the

report of the Committee on Elections.

The case of Mackey, which the majority

is attempting to take up, is the strongest

case which has been before the Commit-  
tee on Elections. In every election dis-

trict in the entire congressional district

the managers of election were Democrats.

They had control of the boxes; they

decided who should vote and who should

not. At the close of the polls more

than 6,000 ballots in excess of the voters

were found in the boxes. It is impossi-  
ble for the Republicans to have committed

this outrage. In drawing out this ex-  
cess only Democrats handled the bal-

lots. When this fraud was consummated,

and the count completed on the evening

of the election at the several precincts,

Mackey had still left a majority of 879.

It is true that his real majority was over

9,000, but the Elections Committee decided

that it would count the vote precisely as

the Democratic managers of election

counted it, and as the supreme court of

South Carolina, in a decision rendered in

this case, said the canvassers ought to

have counted it.

When the returns of the precinct man-  
agers of the three counties comprising

the district were sent up to the county

canvassers the latter found that they

counted them as returned if they

only elect Mackey, but also the full

Republican ticket in both Charleston

and Orangeburg Counties. Something must

be done. In Charleston the Republican

majority, according to the count of the

Democratic precinct managers, was 1,824.

The county board first reversed the poll

of Haut Gap, which had given a Republi-  
can majority of 991, and counted it as

giving a Democratic majority of 1,033.

Next it rejected seven polls in violation

of law, as the supreme court of South

Carolina decided on July 1, 1881. After

this glaring fraud had been committed

O'Connor and the Democratic county

ticket was declared to have received 3,305

majority in that county.

In Orangeburg County, the home of

Samuel Dibble, Mr. Mackey and the Re-  
publican county ticket, according to the

count of the Democratic managers, had

ninety-nine majority. To overcome this

Mr. Dibble filed written protests to the

county board against counting three of

the precincts, and a verbal protest against

counting a fourth, and thereby prevailed

upon the board, every member of which

was a Democrat, to throw out these four

polls. These four polls had, according to

the count of the Democratic precinct

managers, given a Republican majority

of 1,015. By this proceeding, instigated

by Mr. Dibble, the county of Orangeburg

was returned by Mr. Dibble's Democratic

board as giving a majority of 916 for Mr.

O'Connor and the Democratic county

ticket. The supreme court of South Car-  
olina on July 1, 1881, decided that this

was a clear violation of law and that the

county board should have counted the

returns precisely as the Democratic pre-  
cinct managers counted them.

In Clarendon County the cheating was

all done by the Democratic managers,

but the Committee on Elections counted

the vote precisely as the managers and

county board counted it.

It is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

and it is a plain statement of the case,

## CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS.

Passage of the Anti-Polygamy Bill—  
The printing of additional copies of the

testimony concerning civil service reform and of

the report on French spoliation claims was ordered.

Logan reported from the Military Committee

a report, to the effect that the bill for the

provision of the establishment of an Army and

Navy hospital at Hot Springs, Ark. Referred to

Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Cogswell reported from the Committee

on the bill for the establishment of a

military cemetery at Fort Monroe, Va. Referred to

Committee on Appropriations.

On motion of Mr. Logan, the necessary ex-  
penses of the House of Representatives for the

year 1882-83 were ordered to be paid out of the

appropriation for the year 1882-83.

Mr. Miller, of New York, introduced a bill

for the creation of a public building at New

York. Mr. Logan moved to reconsider the

vote on the passage of the bill, and, as the

motion was agreed to, the bill was taken up

for its passage. The motion prevailed—yeas,

20; nays, 22.

Mr. Cogswell, before the result was announced,

changed his vote, and, on motion of Mr. Logan,

the bill was taken up for its passage. The

motion prevailed—yeas, 20; nays, 22.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the

majority was maintained, the bill was

passed by a vote of 20 yeas and 22 nays.

After a continued discussion, in which the